

Ridgfield Park, N. J., a Progressive Suburban

TOWN ADOPTS NEW TAXATION SYSTEM

Somers Method for Assessing Realty in Vogue at Ridgfield Park.

NEW JERSEY VILLAGE OF MANY COMMUTERS

Between 65 and 70 Per Cent of the Workers Are Employed in Manhattan Business Places.

Ridgfield Park is a charming New Jersey village along the West Shore and Susquehanna railroads, only six miles from Manhattan. It is also reached by two trolley lines. It is under a commission form of government, which has lately adopted the Somers system of taxation. This system of appraising land and buildings for assessment purposes is in vogue in some of the cities and villages west of the Ohio River.

The method is used in Cleveland and Columbus, Ohio; Springfield, Ill.; Denver, Mo.; and Dubuque, Iowa; Portland, Ore., and other places. Ridgfield Park is the first community in the middle Atlantic states to adopt the system. One of its chief supporters is Mayor Ernest W. Webber and Adolph Drexler, Commissioner of Streets and Public Improvements. The attorney of the village is Clifford R. Stark, and the village is kept by Mr. Stark. The latter is a capable and hard worker, who takes a keen interest in everything relating to the welfare of the village.

Ridgfield Park is one of the younger but thriving home centers in New Jersey, which has increased from 40 to 50 per cent in population in the last ten years. It is located on one of the most picturesque views in various directions. The village proper is on the crest of a slope, about 500 yards from the railroad station, at an elevation of 100 feet. It is a place of natural beauty, with wooded sections, natural curbed sidewalks are shaded with stately maple and elm trees. Most of the houses are built on plots ranging in size from 40 to 50 by 100 feet, with attractive and well-kept lawns.

The village has many of the advantages of a city. Gas and electricity are installed and there is a good water system. There are seventeen miles of streets, six miles of which have been paved. The village covers an area of three miles in length and one mile in width. The roads are of an amiable and beautiful. Work of improving Summit Street, which was made into a boulevard for some weeks and was finished yesterday.

Ridgfield Park has a population of about 6,500 persons. Between 65 and 70 per cent of the workers are commuters with places of business in New York. Homes have been erected at an average of about 150 houses a year. In all there are about 1,000 houses. The village has many of the advantages of a city. Gas and electricity are installed and there is a good water system. There are seventeen miles of streets, six miles of which have been paved. The village covers an area of three miles in length and one mile in width. The roads are of an amiable and beautiful. Work of improving Summit Street, which was made into a boulevard for some weeks and was finished yesterday.

The village has a volunteer fire department of 140 members. It is composed of six companies, each equipped with an automobile. There are ten fraternal societies, a free public library, three building and loan associations, a national bank, mail delivery service and two newspapers. The Women's Village Improvement Association has done much for the town in helping the needy in distress, assisting the street cleaning department and in other ways. There are a number of lawn tennis courts in the town. Baseball is one of the chief recreations among the younger set at Ridgfield Park, and there are three well laid out diamond fields. Flats 40 by 100 feet in the central part of the town sell for about \$4,000, the same size plot in the extreme lower end for about \$400, at the extreme north end for about \$600, in the easterly section for about \$1,000, and in the westerly section for about \$800.

Ridgfield Park has four schools, one a high school, one a grammar school and another \$60,000. These buildings are of brick, with abundance of space about them for play grounds. The municipal building occupied by the city officials is located at 23d and 24th streets. It was erected in 1911 on a plot 75 by 100 feet. It is a three-story brick structure and cost \$16,000.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.

On June 6, 1902, the residents of Ridgfield Park held an election and voted to break away from Ridgfield Township and incorporate under its own seal. Five years later, by an act of the Legislature, Ridgfield Park became a township. The township embodied the incorporated village.



W. C. STARKER, Village Clerk, Ridgfield Park, N. J.

SEEKS HOME RULE FOR CITY

Broker Says That the State Constitution Should Guarantee It.

By John Finck. A constitutional convention is now in session. Its members are leaders in thought, and men of recognized ability and integrity, sufficiently great to rise above party and stand for the best interests of the people.

The allied real-estate interests and the many civic institutions abounding in New York City, should unite to concentrate their efforts to secure from the delegates to the convention a promise to recommend the incorporation of a clause in the new constitution, guaranteeing to New York City a measure permitting it to regulate its own local affairs, free from all outside interference. This is the time and opportunity, and the convention is the place for the securing of results which ultimately will benefit the millions.

Home rule for New York City has been intermittently advocated for many years, but owing to a lack of generalship little if any progress has been made. Ireland fought for home rule, since and before the days of Parnell, against odds which appeared insurmountable, and the result was the Home Rule of Ireland being overwhelmingly opposed to any concessions. The Irish people fought on, daunted, and by their indomitable determination, succeeded in winning to their cause no less a champion than the immortal Gladstone. After years of fighting, concessions have been granted and home rule has become an accomplished fact.

New York City, the recognized metropolis of the New World, with its over-growing population, is a slave to the upper State, and is not permitted to govern itself. New York City is much to the State, and receives but little in return. It has seemed a difficult matter to pass laws at Albany, which are obnoxious to our interests, even though in nowise hostile to the State.

When we desire to spend money, our own money for our own benefit, we must take off our cap, make humble obeisance, and ask permission from the State, and perhaps drive a sharp bargain, before being permitted to spend our own. All this in face of the fact that the city in real estate value is \$8,000,000,000, compared with \$5,000,000,000 for the rest of the State.

We are victims of mandatory legislation ordering excessive improvements without regard to our indebtedness or borrowing capacity.

BUILDING IN THE BRONX

Six Months' Report Promises a Banner Year.

The first six months of this year shows that 1915 is to be the banner building year for The Bronx. The Superintendent Robert J. Moorehead has issued his semi-annual report. So far, plans for 535 buildings have been filed. The cost of erecting them, it is estimated, will be \$15,897,500. The plans include a schoolhouse at \$225,000 and several amusement places that will cost about \$1,300,000. Plans for a number of expensive apartment houses were also filed.

With the alterations in buildings the total proposed expenditures for the first six months of this year reach the total of \$16,508,231. In the first six months of last year plans for 435 buildings were filed, with an estimated outlay of \$10,003,142, and alterations increased this amount to \$10,868,078. This year so far is about half a million dollars ahead of 1914, which was the largest previous building year for The Bronx.

In addition to the amendments proposed to restrict buildings' heights and to establish zones, there was also a third amendment to the constitution proposed, which provides for the condemnation of unsanitary blocks when public health demands that they be converted into public parks. In this connection the power is also given to the city to condemn excess lands which, if not needed for the public park, shall be no more than sufficient to form suitable building sites abutting on the park. This land may be sold or leased with or without restrictions. Five amendments in all covering all these phases of real estate improvement were submitted to the Constitutional Convention.

Three were introduced by William Bannister, president of the Brooklyn Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. These amendments were drafted by the advisory council of Real Estate Interests and the tenement house committees of the New York City Board of Health.

The third amendment confers upon the Legislature the power to take real property which is dangerous to public health or safety and sell or lease the same, subject to such restrictions as may be deemed to be in the public interest. These amendments are the first public step to be taken by the Three-Family House Committee of the Advisory Council upon which the New York City Board of Health has been organized.

Represented by Alfred T. White and Darwin R. James, Jr., with Paul E. Cravath, ex-officio. In order to encourage the construction of small family houses, and, if possible, to decrease the number of fifty-foot tenement houses and skyscraper office buildings it was deemed expedient to impress upon the Constitutional Convention the wisdom of incorporating these amendments into the constitution. The general sentiment among real estate men is that restrictions upon height and zoning would do much to stabilize property values, and at the same time prevent values from shifting. Experience has conclusively demonstrated that the erection of mammoth buildings causes adjoining property to depreciate in value, and likewise deprives smaller buildings of tenants. In many cases it is understood that the larger buildings have taken over leases of tenants in other buildings, at great expense, with the result that unrestricted building has been detrimental to both small and large property owners. If real estate owners will not conserve their own interests by moderation, then it is necessary that in the interests of the community as a whole certain restrictions be established. At the present time the large office building is far from a paying investment, while the small family house, which is the most desirable of all, is being depreciated by the value of adjoining property. The history of real estate development, the result of the invasion of residential blocks by industrial and business enterprises is concerned, illustrates that the zoning principle would prove to be of considerable benefit to a healthy real estate growth.

Probably one of the most discouraging features in the real estate world is the decline in the number of property owners. It is estimated that the actual number of owners, including corporations, is approximately 125,000.

The third amendment confers upon the Legislature the power to take real property which is dangerous to public health or safety and sell or lease the same, subject to such restrictions as may be deemed to be in the public interest. These amendments are the first public step to be taken by the Three-Family House Committee of the Advisory Council upon which the New York City Board of Health has been organized.

Represented by Alfred T. White and Darwin R. James, Jr., with Paul E. Cravath, ex-officio. In order to encourage the construction of small family houses, and, if possible, to decrease the number of fifty-foot tenement houses and skyscraper office buildings it was deemed expedient to impress upon the Constitutional Convention the wisdom of incorporating these amendments into the constitution. The general sentiment among real estate men is that restrictions upon height and zoning would do much to stabilize property values, and at the same time prevent values from shifting. Experience has conclusively demonstrated that the erection of mammoth buildings causes adjoining property to depreciate in value, and likewise deprives smaller buildings of tenants. In many cases it is understood that the larger buildings have taken over leases of tenants in other buildings, at great expense, with the result that unrestricted building has been detrimental to both small and large property owners. If real estate owners will not conserve their own interests by moderation, then it is necessary that in the interests of the community as a whole certain restrictions be established. At the present time the large office building is far from a paying investment, while the small family house, which is the most desirable of all, is being depreciated by the value of adjoining property. The history of real estate development, the result of the invasion of residential blocks by industrial and business enterprises is concerned, illustrates that the zoning principle would prove to be of considerable benefit to a healthy real estate growth.

Probably one of the most discouraging features in the real estate world is the decline in the number of property owners. It is estimated that the actual number of owners, including corporations, is approximately 125,000.

The third amendment confers upon the Legislature the power to take real property which is dangerous to public health or safety and sell or lease the same, subject to such restrictions as may be deemed to be in the public interest. These amendments are the first public step to be taken by the Three-Family House Committee of the Advisory Council upon which the New York City Board of Health has been organized.

Represented by Alfred T. White and Darwin R. James, Jr., with Paul E. Cravath, ex-officio. In order to encourage the construction of small family houses, and, if possible, to decrease the number of fifty-foot tenement houses and skyscraper office buildings it was deemed expedient to impress upon the Constitutional Convention the wisdom of incorporating these amendments into the constitution. The general sentiment among real estate men is that restrictions upon height and zoning would do much to stabilize property values, and at the same time prevent values from shifting. Experience has conclusively demonstrated that the erection of mammoth buildings causes adjoining property to depreciate in value, and likewise deprives smaller buildings of tenants. In many cases it is understood that the larger buildings have taken over leases of tenants in other buildings, at great expense, with the result that unrestricted building has been detrimental to both small and large property owners. If real estate owners will not conserve their own interests by moderation, then it is necessary that in the interests of the community as a whole certain restrictions be established. At the present time the large office building is far from a paying investment, while the small family house, which is the most desirable of all, is being depreciated by the value of adjoining property. The history of real estate development, the result of the invasion of residential blocks by industrial and business enterprises is concerned, illustrates that the zoning principle would prove to be of considerable benefit to a healthy real estate growth.

TAX CONFERENCE NEXT MONTH

Will Be the Ninth Annual Meeting of the National Body.

SAN FRANCISCO CONVENTION CITY

Many Important Subjects To Be Discussed by Members and Delegates.

Owing to the increasing interest shown in the national and local taxation, the ninth annual conference of the National Tax Association, which will be held on August 10 to 14 at San Francisco, is expected to be the most important ever held. Professor E. R. A. Seligman, of Columbia University, is president of the association; S. T. Howe, chairman of the Kansas Tax Commission, vice-president, and T. S. Adams, of the Wisconsin Tax Commission, secretary.

Reports will be submitted by the Committee on the Federal Income Tax, of which Professor E. R. A. Seligman is chairman, by the Committee on the Increase of Public Expenditures, of which T. S. Adams, of the Wisconsin Tax Commission, is chairman, and by the Federal Trade Bureau, presenting a review of recent tax legislation in various states. It is expected that representatives of the Treasury Department will take part in the discussion on the Federal income tax report, the aim being to get suggestions on how the law may be amended to secure better administrative results and remove objectionable features.

The various practical problems which are encountered by the state taxing officials will not be overlooked at the conference. It is hoped that some solutions may be the result. Judge Oscar Leser, of the Maryland Tax Commission, will have charge of this session, in which officials from many states will take part. Developments in taxation in California and the Far Western states will be featured for the benefit of the visitors. Among the other numerous special topics that will come up for discussion are the classification of taxable subjects, efficiency in the collection of taxes, taxation of corporations, tax limit laws, valuations of property, the status of intangible property and the recent action on constitutional amendments. The conference will extend over five days. The session will be so arranged that the delegates will have ample time to visit the exposition.

Home rule for New York City has been intermittently advocated for many years, but owing to a lack of generalship little if any progress has been made. Ireland fought for home rule, since and before the days of Parnell, against odds which appeared insurmountable, and the result was the Home Rule of Ireland being overwhelmingly opposed to any concessions. The Irish people fought on, daunted, and by their indomitable determination, succeeded in winning to their cause no less a champion than the immortal Gladstone. After years of fighting, concessions have been granted and home rule has become an accomplished fact.

New York City, the recognized metropolis of the New World, with its over-growing population, is a slave to the upper State, and is not permitted to govern itself. New York City is much to the State, and receives but little in return. It has seemed a difficult matter to pass laws at Albany, which are obnoxious to our interests, even though in nowise hostile to the State.

When we desire to spend money, our own money for our own benefit, we must take off our cap, make humble obeisance, and ask permission from the State, and perhaps drive a sharp bargain, before being permitted to spend our own. All this in face of the fact that the city in real estate value is \$8,000,000,000, compared with \$5,000,000,000 for the rest of the State.

We are victims of mandatory legislation ordering excessive improvements without regard to our indebtedness or borrowing capacity.

BUILDING IN THE BRONX

Six Months' Report Promises a Banner Year.

The first six months of this year shows that 1915 is to be the banner building year for The Bronx. The Superintendent Robert J. Moorehead has issued his semi-annual report. So far, plans for 535 buildings have been filed. The cost of erecting them, it is estimated, will be \$15,897,500. The plans include a schoolhouse at \$225,000 and several amusement places that will cost about \$1,300,000. Plans for a number of expensive apartment houses were also filed.

With the alterations in buildings the total proposed expenditures for the first six months of this year reach the total of \$16,508,231. In the first six months of last year plans for 435 buildings were filed, with an estimated outlay of \$10,003,142, and alterations increased this amount to \$10,868,078. This year so far is about half a million dollars ahead of 1914, which was the largest previous building year for The Bronx.

In addition to the amendments proposed to restrict buildings' heights and to establish zones, there was also a third amendment to the constitution proposed, which provides for the condemnation of unsanitary blocks when public health demands that they be converted into public parks. In this connection the power is also given to the city to condemn excess lands which, if not needed for the public park, shall be no more than sufficient to form suitable building sites abutting on the park. This land may be sold or leased with or without restrictions. Five amendments in all covering all these phases of real estate improvement were submitted to the Constitutional Convention.

Three were introduced by William Bannister, president of the Brooklyn Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. These amendments were drafted by the advisory council of Real Estate Interests and the tenement house committees of the New York City Board of Health.

The third amendment confers upon the Legislature the power to take real property which is dangerous to public health or safety and sell or lease the same, subject to such restrictions as may be deemed to be in the public interest. These amendments are the first public step to be taken by the Three-Family House Committee of the Advisory Council upon which the New York City Board of Health has been organized.

Represented by Alfred T. White and Darwin R. James, Jr., with Paul E. Cravath, ex-officio. In order to encourage the construction of small family houses, and, if possible, to decrease the number of fifty-foot tenement houses and skyscraper office buildings it was deemed expedient to impress upon the Constitutional Convention the wisdom of incorporating these amendments into the constitution. The general sentiment among real estate men is that restrictions upon height and zoning would do much to stabilize property values, and at the same time prevent values from shifting. Experience has conclusively demonstrated that the erection of mammoth buildings causes adjoining property to depreciate in value, and likewise deprives smaller buildings of tenants. In many cases it is understood that the larger buildings have taken over leases of tenants in other buildings, at great expense, with the result that unrestricted building has been detrimental to both small and large property owners. If real estate owners will not conserve their own interests by moderation, then it is necessary that in the interests of the community as a whole certain restrictions be established. At the present time the large office building is far from a paying investment, while the small family house, which is the most desirable of all, is being depreciated by the value of adjoining property. The history of real estate development, the result of the invasion of residential blocks by industrial and business enterprises is concerned, illustrates that the zoning principle would prove to be of considerable benefit to a healthy real estate growth.

Probably one of the most discouraging features in the real estate world is the decline in the number of property owners. It is estimated that the actual number of owners, including corporations, is approximately 125,000.

The third amendment confers upon the Legislature the power to take real property which is dangerous to public health or safety and sell or lease the same, subject to such restrictions as may be deemed to be in the public interest. These amendments are the first public step to be taken by the Three-Family House Committee of the Advisory Council upon which the New York City Board of Health has been organized.

Represented by Alfred T. White and Darwin R. James, Jr., with Paul E. Cravath, ex-officio. In order to encourage the construction of small family houses, and, if possible, to decrease the number of fifty-foot tenement houses and skyscraper office buildings it was deemed expedient to impress upon the Constitutional Convention the wisdom of incorporating these amendments into the constitution. The general sentiment among real estate men is that restrictions upon height and zoning would do much to stabilize property values, and at the same time prevent values from shifting. Experience has conclusively demonstrated that the erection of mammoth buildings causes adjoining property to depreciate in value, and likewise deprives smaller buildings of tenants. In many cases it is understood that the larger buildings have taken over leases of tenants in other buildings, at great expense, with the result that unrestricted building has been detrimental to both small and large property owners. If real estate owners will not conserve their own interests by moderation, then it is necessary that in the interests of the community as a whole certain restrictions be established. At the present time the large office building is far from a paying investment, while the small family house, which is the most desirable of all, is being depreciated by the value of adjoining property. The history of real estate development, the result of the invasion of residential blocks by industrial and business enterprises is concerned, illustrates that the zoning principle would prove to be of considerable benefit to a healthy real estate growth.

Probably one of the most discouraging features in the real estate world is the decline in the number of property owners. It is estimated that the actual number of owners, including corporations, is approximately 125,000.

The third amendment confers upon the Legislature the power to take real property which is dangerous to public health or safety and sell or lease the same, subject to such restrictions as may be deemed to be in the public interest. These amendments are the first public step to be taken by the Three-Family House Committee of the Advisory Council upon which the New York City Board of Health has been organized.

Represented by Alfred T. White and Darwin R. James, Jr., with Paul E. Cravath, ex-officio. In order to encourage the construction of small family houses, and, if possible, to decrease the number of fifty-foot tenement houses and skyscraper office buildings it was deemed expedient to impress upon the Constitutional Convention the wisdom of incorporating these amendments into the constitution. The general sentiment among real estate men is that restrictions upon height and zoning would do much to stabilize property values, and at the same time prevent values from shifting. Experience has conclusively demonstrated that the erection of mammoth buildings causes adjoining property to depreciate in value, and likewise deprives smaller buildings of tenants. In many cases it is understood that the larger buildings have taken over leases of tenants in other buildings, at great expense, with the result that unrestricted building has been detrimental to both small and large property owners. If real estate owners will not conserve their own interests by moderation, then it is necessary that in the interests of the community as a whole certain restrictions be established. At the present time the large office building is far from a paying investment, while the small family house, which is the most desirable of all, is being depreciated by the value of adjoining property. The history of real estate development, the result of the invasion of residential blocks by industrial and business enterprises is concerned, illustrates that the zoning principle would prove to be of considerable benefit to a healthy real estate growth.



ADOLPH R. DEXHEIMER, Member of Board of Assessors, Ridgfield Park, N. J.

INVESTOR BUYS 57TH ST. BUILDING

Structure Near Fifth Ave. Has Been Held at \$300,000.

William B. May & Co. have sold for the 25 West Fifty-Seventh Street Company, of which L. Napoleon Levy is president, and Nathan Hirsch treasurer, the six-story commercial structure at 25 West 57th st., occupying a lot 25x100.5 feet, located 450 feet west of Fifth ave. The property was held at \$300,000 and has been taken by an investor. The building is fully occupied by business concerns, including Pappe, Inc., milliners.

The selling company acquired the property last year through the same brokers from John W. Simpson in an exchange for the Biltmore-Blenheim apartments, at 56 to 62 West 58th st., just east of Sixth ave.

Other sales follow:

176TH ST.—F. J. Wood, in conjunction with Joseph P. Day, sold the plot, 75x157 feet, on the north side of 176th st., located about midway between Boston Road and Daly ave.

176TH ST.—Lauterbach, Inc., sold for the Charles T. Street Construction Company 742 East 176th st., a five-story apartment house, on a plot 50x190 feet.

JESSUP AV.—M. S. Auerbach has sold to Frank Banister a plot, 75x100 feet, on the east side of Jessup av., between Featherbed Lane and 172d st., located about midway between the Upland Realty Company tract, which was recently sold at auction by Bryan L. Kennedy.

4TH ST.—Valentine A. Schults has sold for the George Pennell estate the five-story tenement 211 East 4th st., on lot 20x96 feet.

Apartment Leases.

Douglas L. Elliman & Co. have leased a duplex apartment in 830 Park av., corner of 76th st., to E. S. Meacham; an apartment in the same building at 309 Park av., corner of 54th st., to Archibald S. White, and in conjunction with S. Osgood Pell & Co., an apartment in 103 East 86th st. to Mrs. Arthur Murphy.

Van Norden & Wilson have leased a large apartment in the Sutherland, 155th st., and Riverside Drive, to Arthur B. Lefler for a term of years.

Pease & Thorpe have rented an apartment in 60 West 38th st. to Mrs. A. H. Carrington; in 555 Park av., to Miss Jane H. Swartz; in 43 East 27th st., to Miss Beatrice E. Carr, and in 411 West 14th st., to Edward E. Page.

Advocate State Control of Building Height

Unusual Large Delegation of Real Estate Men and Their Representatives Invade Albany in Behalf of Economic Principles—Favor Condemnation of Unsanitary Blocks for Park Use When Public Health Demands—Decline in the Number of Property Owners in New York City.

By Advisory Council of Real Estate Interests.

Seldom has Albany witnessed a more representative delegation appearing in behalf of economic principles which are vital to real estate than that which advocated restrictions of buildings' heights and zones for all incorporated municipalities in New York State. So much significance was attached to these particular principles that a joint hearing was called of both the Committee on City of which Seth Low is chairman, and the Bill of Rights Committee, of which Louis Marshall is chairman.

In addition to the amendments proposed to restrict buildings' heights and to establish zones, there was also a third amendment to the constitution proposed, which provides for the condemnation of unsanitary blocks when public health demands that they be converted into public parks. In this connection the power is also given to the city to condemn excess lands which, if not needed for the public park, shall be no more than sufficient to form suitable building sites abutting on the park. This land may be sold or leased with or without restrictions. Five amendments in all covering all these phases of real estate improvement were submitted to the Constitutional Convention.

Three were introduced by William Bannister, president of the Brooklyn Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. These amendments were drafted by the advisory council of Real Estate Interests and the tenement house committees of the New York City Board of Health.

The third amendment confers upon the Legislature the power to take real property which is dangerous to public health or safety and sell or lease the same, subject to such restrictions as may be deemed to be in the public interest. These amendments are the first public step to be taken by the Three-Family House Committee of the Advisory Council upon which the New York City Board of Health has been organized.

Represented by Alfred T. White and Darwin R. James, Jr., with Paul E. Cravath, ex-officio. In order to encourage the construction of small family houses, and, if possible, to decrease the number of fifty-foot tenement houses and skyscraper office buildings it was deemed expedient to impress upon the Constitutional Convention the wisdom of incorporating these amendments into the constitution. The general sentiment among real estate men is that restrictions upon height and zoning would do much to stabilize property values, and at the same time prevent values from shifting. Experience has conclusively demonstrated that the erection of mammoth buildings causes adjoining property to depreciate in value, and likewise deprives smaller buildings of tenants. In many cases it is understood that the larger buildings have taken over leases of tenants in other buildings, at great expense, with the result that unrestricted building has been detrimental to both small and large property owners. If real estate owners will not conserve their own interests by moderation, then it is necessary that in the interests of the community as a whole certain restrictions be established. At the present time the large office building is far from a paying investment, while the small family house, which is the most desirable of all, is being depreciated by the value of adjoining property. The history of real estate development, the result of the invasion of residential blocks by industrial and business enterprises is concerned, illustrates that the zoning principle would prove to be of considerable benefit to a healthy real estate growth.

Probably one of the most discouraging features in the real estate world is the decline in the number of property owners. It is estimated that the actual number of owners, including corporations, is approximately 125,000.

The third amendment confers upon the Legislature the power to take real property which is dangerous to public health or safety and sell or lease the same, subject to such restrictions as may be deemed to be in the public interest. These amendments are the first public step to be taken by the Three-Family House Committee of the Advisory Council upon which the New York City Board of Health has been organized.

Represented by Alfred T. White and Darwin R. James, Jr., with Paul E. Cravath, ex-officio. In order to encourage the construction of small family houses, and, if possible, to decrease the number of fifty-foot tenement houses and skyscraper office buildings it was deemed expedient to impress upon the Constitutional Convention the wisdom of incorporating these amendments into the constitution. The general sentiment among real estate men is that restrictions upon height and zoning would do much to stabilize property values, and at the same time prevent values from shifting. Experience has conclusively demonstrated that the erection of mammoth buildings causes adjoining property to depreciate in value, and likewise deprives smaller buildings of tenants. In many cases it is understood that the larger buildings have taken over leases of tenants in other buildings, at great expense, with the result that unrestricted building has been detrimental to both small and large property owners. If real estate owners will not conserve their own interests by moderation, then it is necessary that in the interests of the community as a whole certain restrictions be established. At the present time the large office building is far from a paying investment, while the small family house, which is the most desirable of all, is being depreciated by the value of adjoining property. The history of real estate development, the result of the invasion of residential blocks by industrial and business enterprises is concerned, illustrates that the zoning principle would